



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/750,813	12/28/2000	Kazutoshi Ishikawa	SANKY P-198/500615.20085	8264

26418 7590 08/13/2003

REED SMITH, LLP  
ATTN: PATENT RECORDS DEPARTMENT  
599 LEXINGTON AVENUE, 29TH FLOOR  
NEW YORK, NY 10022-7650

EXAMINER
----------

FRANKLIN, JAMARA ALZAIDA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2876

DATE MAILED: 08/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/750,813	ISHIKAWA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jamara A. Franklin	2876

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 July 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,5 and 8 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,5 and 8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 December 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Acknowledgment is made of the receipt of the amendment filed on 7/19/03. Claims 1, 5, and 8 are currently pending.

### ***Drawings***

1. Figure 15 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 1 and 8 are objected to because of the following informalities:

in claim 1, line 9, substitute “wherein said switch and said moving member are moved” with --a switch and a moving member which move--;

in claim 1, line 9, substitute “the” with --a--;

in claim 8, line 2, substitute each occurrence of “a” with --said--;

in claim 8, line 2, delete “being capable of”; and

in claim 8, line 4, substitute “I/O” with --input/output--.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mita et al. (US 5,045,674) (hereinafter referred to as 'Mita') in view of Muto et al. (US 5,478,996) (hereinafter referred to as 'Muto').

Mita teaches an IC card reader/writer having a connector 7 fixed pivotally on a supporting member 8. Connector 7 has contact members 7A adapted to come into contact with contacts on an IC card. Support member 8 is fixed to a rotation shaft 9 which is rotatably supported. When the rotating shaft 9 is rotated by an actuator 13 in response to a detection output of a first sensor 6, the connector 7 is moved to contact the contacts on the IC card.

Mita lacks the teaching of a control circuit board mounted to the contact blocks.

Muto teaches a IC card reading assembly having a circuit board 40 mounted upon contact terminals 36 to be brought into contact with external terminals of a IC card (col. 5, lines 50-54 and 63-65).

One of ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized that placing the circuit board atop the contacts block would have been a beneficial enhancement of the invention of Mita by minimizing the size of the card reader since the circuit board would have been integrated into a pre-existing area of the reader. Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time the

invention was made, to modify the teachings of Mita with the arrangement of the circuit board as taught by Muto to make the card reader more compact.

***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 5 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The examiner would also like to note that while features of an apparatus may be recited either structurally or functionally, claims directed to an apparatus must be distinguished from the prior art in terms of structure rather than function. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 1477-78, 44 USPQ2d 1429, 1431-32 (Fed. Cir. 1997) (The absence of a disclosure in a prior art reference relating to function did not defeat the Board's finding of anticipation of claimed apparatus because the limitations at issue were found to be inherent in the prior art reference); see also *In re Swinehart*, 439 F.2d 210, 212-13, 169 USPQ 226, 228-29 (CCPA 1971); *In re Danly*, 263 F.2d 844, 847, 120 USPQ 528, 531 (CCPA 1959). "[A]pparatus claims cover what a device *is*, not what a device *does*." *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb Inc.*, 909 F.2d 1464, 1469, 15 USPQ2d 1525, 1528 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (emphasis in original).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jamara A. Franklin whose telephone number is 703-305-0128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:00am to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (703) 305-3503. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Jamara A. Franklin  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2876

JAF  
July 30, 2003

  
MICHAEL G. LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800